UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,727	04/06/2006	David Kren	356952.00043-US	1901
	7590 03/10/201 P (Philadelphia)	EXAMINER		
Attn: Patent Do	cket Clerk	RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L		
2 North Second Harrisburg, PA	·=		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/574,727	KREN, DAVID		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWC MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed off A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje	octed claims					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		cied ciaims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (DTOL_324)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant Americanient (10L-02+).				
 Applicants reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).			_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu	t before or on the date of filing a Ne	tice of Appeal will not	he entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. A The request for reconsideration has been consider because:	ered but does NOT place the applic	ation in condition for a	allowance				
See Continuation Sheet.	(DTO(0D(00) D						
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ((P10/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.							
	/Amelia Putledge/						
	/Amelia Rutledge/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2176					
	i illiary Examilier, Alt O	III. 4 I I U					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The proposed amendments will not be entered because independent claims 8 and 9 contain newly claimed limitations which narrow the scope of the claims and would require further consideration and search. Specifically, claim 8 recites "a predefined element, attribute or attribute value to enable a string based mark up language to be parsed", and claim 9 recites "a predefined element, attribute, or attribute value to enable a string based mark up language to be generated." Previously, the claims recited "...to enable a string based mark up language to be handled." Therefore the newly claimed steps to enable the language to be parsed or generated rather than "handled" narrow the scope of the claimed invention and will not be entered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's remarks filed 03/04/2010 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that "Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests a way to map a unique integer value to tokens and strings, because no one has developed a parser for tokens and strings." See Remarks, p. 7, par. 2. However, Milau clearly discloses mapping and parsing tokens to a unique integer value. Further, applicant's arguments including the assertion of p. 7, par. 2 of the remarks, are not applicable to "parsers" as generally known in computer science. In the prior art at the time of the invention, there were numerous parsers for tokens and strings since tokens and strings were the standard input for parsers.

Further, Milau does teach the index mapping that unique integer value (a) to a token associated with a predefined element, attribute or attribute value to enable a token based mark up language to be handled; because Milau teaches defining integer tokens for the tag code space, i.e., elements, the attribute names code space and the attribute value code space (p. 5-7; Table 2).

For these reasons, and the reasons of record, the rejections of claims 1-15 are being maintained .